

ROUTING AND TRANSMITTAL SLIP		Date
TO: (Name, office symbol, room number, building, Agency/Post)		20 FEB 1985
1. EC/DDA	Initials	Date 20-2
2. ADDA		20 FEB 1985
3. DDA		20 FEB 1985
4.		
5. DDA Registry (file)		21 Feb
Action	File	Note and Return
Approval	For Clearance	Per Conversation
As Requested	For Correction	Prepare Reply
Circulate	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> For Your Information	See Me
Comment	Investigate	Signature
Coordination	Justify	

REMARKS

The DDA did not receive the initial 23 January 85 letter.

cc: D/SECURITY

done 2/20/85

DO NOT use this form as a RECORD of approvals, concurrences, disposals, clearances, and similar actions

FROM: (Name, org. symbol, Agency/Post)	Room No.—Bldg.
EC/DDA 7D18 HQS	
	Phone No.

5041-102

☆ GPO : 1981 O - 361-529 (148)

OPTIONAL FORM 41 (Rev. 7-76)
Prescribed by GSA
FPMR (41 CFR) 101-11.206

**EXECUTIVE SECRETARIAT
ROUTING SLIP**

TO:		ACTION	INFO	DATE	INITIAL
1	DCI				
2	DDCI				
3	EXDIR				
4	D/ICS				
5	DDI				
6	DDA				
7	DDO				
8	DDS&T				
9	Chm/NIC				
10	GC				
11	IG				
12	Compt				
13	D/Pers				
14	D/OLL				
15	D/PAO				
16	SA/IA				
17	AO/DCI				
18	C/IPD/OIS				
19	NIO				
20					
21					
22					
SUSPENSE		Date _____			

Remarks

Executive Secretary

Date



POLICY

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20301 -2200

Executive Registry

85- 361/1

11 FEB 1985

DD/A Registry

85-0583

In reply refer to:
I-05277/85

Honorable William J. Casey
Director
Central Intelligence Agency
Washington, D.C. 20505

DD/A REGISTRY

FILE: 100-12

Dear Mr. Casey:

Thank you for your letter of 23 January 1985 relative to the NSDD-84 options paper forwarded to Mr. McFarlane on 1 May 1984.

I agree that the study has got off to a good start. We strongly feel that with optimum participation and cooperation of the member departments and agencies, much needed upgrading of the federal personnel security program can be achieved. However, I do share your concern that we must insure the effort not take unexpected turns--or result in the weakening of existing rules with respect to intelligence sources and methods data.

I fully agree with your recommendation that we closely monitor the progress of the NSDD-84 options study in view of its importance to the overall improvement of the Federal personnel security program. Let me assure you that we will continue to give the study our best effort.

Recently, we were advised that the National Security Council staff has no problems with the study group recommendations, and we could expect a response very shortly. However, no formal reply has been received to date.

Therefore, in accordance with your suggestion and in order to insure the momentum on this important task, I have just dispatched the enclosed letter to Mr. McFarlane. My people and I will continue to participate fully in this important effort and look forward to working closely with your staff in developing substantive policy recommendations.

Sincerely,

Richard G. Stilwell
Richard G. Stilwell
General, USA (Ret.)
Deputy

Enclosure
a/s



POLICY

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20301 -2200

11 FEB 1985

In reply refer to:
I-05277/85

The Honorable Robert C. McFarlane
Assistant to the President for
National Security Affairs
The White House
Washington, D.C. 20500

Dear Mr. McFarlane:

On March 11, 1983, the President issued National Security Decision Directive Number 84 (NSDD-84) which, among other things, tasked the Attorney General, in consultation with the Director, Office of Personnel Management (OPM), to establish an interdepartmental group to study the federal personnel security program and recommend appropriate revisions to existing Executive Orders, regulations, and guidelines.

During the period March 1983 to April 1984 this group, under the leadership of Ms. Mary Lawton of the Office of Intelligence Policy and Review, Department of Justice (DOJ), met with representatives of OPM, Defense, FBI, Energy, State and Treasury to identify approaches to comply with the President's tasking. After many meetings over the course of the year, several fundamental policy issues requiring the guidance of the National Security Council were identified by the working group and presented to the Senior Interagency Group/Intelligence (SIG-I) for review.


On May 1, 1984, after approval by the SIG-I, all of these issues, together with recommendations, were forwarded to you for consideration and approval.

The Director of Central Intelligence and I are anxious to have this important effort commence once again. All agree that changes in the federal personnel security program are needed, and DoD, for its part, is holding certain actions in this area in abeyance which are dependent upon fundamental national decisions accruing from the study. You should also be aware that the Permanent Investigations Subcommittee of the Senate Government Operations Committee will hold hearings at the end of this month on federal personnel security programs. It would be desirable for us to advise the Committee that the Executive branch effort, begun in 1983, has been reinvigorated.

2

I would appreciate, therefore, your endorsing the paper forwarded by the SIG-I last May, and returning it to Ms. Lawton for appropriate follow-up by her working group.

Sincerely,


RICHARD G. STILWELL
General, USA (Ret.)
Chairman, IG/CM

cc:
Mr. Casey
Ms. Lawton